REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The Office Action rejected all presently pending claims 1-19. Specifically, the Office Action rejected claims 1-8, 10-13 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US 6,776,880) in view of Burrows et al. (US 6,013,538). The Office Action also rejected claims 9, 14 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US 6,776,880) in view of Burrows et al. (US 6,013,538) as applied to claims 1, 10 and 15, and further in view of Watanabe et al. (US 2002/0017864). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and reconsideration of those amended claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Office Action Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 1-8, 10-13 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US 6,776,880) in view of Burrows et al. (US 6,013,538). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Independent claim 1 recites the features as follows:

> 1. A mass-production packaging means suitable for mass-production packaging of an organic luminescent display, comprising at least:
> a panel feeding system used to send an organic luminescent display panel into the mass-production packaging means;
> ***an UV pretreatment system used to clean the surface of the organic luminescent display panel***;
> a sizing system used to apply the cleaned surface of the organic electroluminescent display panel with a molding compound;
> ***a lid feeding system used to send a lid into the mass-production packaging means***;
> an alignment/lamination system used to align the lid with the organic electroluminescent display panel and perform the lamination;

an UV irradiation system used to provide UV light to cure the molding compound;

a product output system used to convey one of the packaged products outside of the packaging means;

a transportation system used to convey the organic electroluminescent display panel to the panel feeding system, the UV pretreatment system, the sizing system, the lid feeding system, the alignment/lamination system, the UV irradiation system and the product output system in a continuous way; and

an atmosphere control system used to control water vapor and oxygen content in the packaging means.

(emphasis added).

Independent claim 15 recites the features as follows:

15. A mass-production packaging means suitable for mass-production packaging of an organic luminescent display, comprising at least :

a sizing system having at least two sizing heads, which are used to apply a molding compound on a surface of the organic electroluminescent display panel;

an alignment/lamination/UV irradiation system used to align the lid with the organic electroluminescent display panel to perform lamination, and provide UV light to cure the molding compound;

a transportation system used to convey the organic electroluminescent display panel to the sizing system and the alignment/lamination/UV irradiation system in a continuous way; and

an atmosphere control system used to control water vapor and oxygen content in the packaging means.

(emphasis added).

First, Applicants would elucidate some misinterpretations in the Office Action. The "***UV pretreatment system***" cited in Claim 1 is not a process limitation, in other words, the "***UV pretreatment system***" is a cleaning tool equipped in the mass-production packaging means. The ***UV pretreatment system*** is different from the UV irradiation system for curing the molding compound.

In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985), "[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by the process, ***determination of patentability is based on the product itself***. The patentability of...", however, Applicants assert that the subject matter is a "mass-production packaging means", not a product (OEL devices) fabricated by the process performed in the "mass-production packaging means". Thus, Claims 1 and 15 are not "product-by-process claims".

In addition, the UV pretreatment system cited in Claim 1 is not disclosed by Yamazaki and Burrows et al. Specifically, Yamazaki fails to teach or suggest that the UV radiation mechanism 304 can be utilized to pre-clean the panels, and no UV cleaning system is discussed in the disclosure of Burrows et al. Thus, it would have been non-obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate ***an UV pretreatment system*** with the system of Yamazaki.

On the other hand, in re Col. 2, lines 20-39 of Burrows (US 6,013,538), the "protective cap 118" is a thin film formed over the top electrode 117 instead of a "lid", as disclosed by Burrows, the "protective cap 118" may be formed by deposition. Since no sealant (molding compound) is needed to adhere the "protective cap 118" with the top electrode 117, Applicants assert that the "protective cap 118" is different from the lid of the present invention. Furthermore, in re Col. 2, lines 20-39 of Burrows (US 6,013,538), only a process of forming the protective cap 118 is mentioned, but no disclosure relevant to "lid feeding system" or other equipments is further discussed. Thus, there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the "protective cap 118" with the system of Yamazaki.

The Office Action also rejected claims 9, 14 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US 6,776,880) in view of Burrows et al. (US 6,013,538) as applied to claims 1, 10 and 15, and further in view of Watanabe et al. (US 2002/0017864). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Dependent claims 9 and 19 recites the features as follows:

> 9. The mass-production packaging means of claim 1, wherein the molding compound is an UV paste.
>
> 19. The mass-production packaging means of claim 15, wherein the molding compound is an UV paste.

In re paragraph [0469] of Watanabe et al., "After the paste has been cured by means of heat or ultraviolet rays, the cured paste is taken out of the mold and sintered to thereby simultaneously forming the transparent barrier ribs and the transparent dielectric layer. On this occasion, the thickness of the transparent dielectric layer is determined depending on the pressure and pressing time by the flat press or roll press, as well as on the hardness of the paste". The **transparent barrier ribs and the transparent dielectric layer** disclosed by Watanabe et al. are utilized to define discharge spaces in the PDP, but not for packaging the OEL devices. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 15 patently define over the prior art references, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 2-9 and 16-19 patently define over the prior art as well.

Application No. : 09/852,188 **Docket No.: JCLA6418**

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-19 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
J.C. PATENTS

Date: 4/22/2005

Jiawei Huang
Registration No. 43,330

4 Venture, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 660-0761
Fax: (949)-660-0809